United Nations PBC/1/OC/SR.2*

Peacebuilding Commission

Distr.: General
24 August 2006

Original: English

Organizational Committee
First session

Summary record of the 2nd meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Thursday, 13 July 2006, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Gaspar Martins ..... (Angola)

Contents

Adoption of the agenda

Briefing on preliminary activities of the Organizational Committee

Selection of participants in country-specific meetings

Process and schedule of country-specific meetings

Other matters

* Reissued for technical reasons; see PBC/1/INF/2.

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent *within one week of the date of this document* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Any corrections to the record of this meeting and of other meetings will be issued in a corrigendum.

06-42887* (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

1. *The agenda was adopted.*

Briefing on preliminary activities of the Organizational Committee

2. **The Chairman** said that, since the inaugural meeting of the Committee, he and the Vice-Chairpersons of the Committee had held preliminary meetings with the representatives of Burundi and Sierra Leone, which had been provisionally chosen as the subjects for the Committee's first two country-specific meetings, as well as representatives of the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the Interparliamentary Union (IPU). They had also held talks with the Presidents of the Economic and Social Council, the Security Council and the General Assembly.

3. The President of the Economic and Social Council had expressed the view that the Peacebuilding Commission should assume the role currently performed by the ECOSOC Ad Hoc Advisory Group on Burundi. However, in the case of countries such as Guinea-Bissau and Haiti, which were not yet on the Commission's agenda, the relevant ad hoc groups should continue to play a role during a transitional period. The Council President had also raised the question of the relationship between the Council and the Commission, and had proposed the establishment of a reporting mechanism, which might take the form of an oral report to be submitted during the substantive session of the Council.

4. The President of the General Assembly had expressed the desire to participate in the country-specific meetings, which had been provisionally scheduled for 7 and 8 September 2006, in New York. He had proposed that during the meetings the Organizational Committee should, while drawing on the proposals of the two respective Governments, focus on a few selected areas in which it felt that the Commission could make a difference by meeting the basic needs of the population. He had also proposed that the Committee should consider visiting Sierra Leone and Burundi in order to establish an on-site dialogue with the national authorities.

5. The meeting with the representatives of the World Bank and the IMF had consisted of a preliminary exchange of views on the experience of the World Bank in the two countries. That experience would be useful to the Commission's work. Both institutions had expressed support for the holding of briefings on the two countries, with the participation of their respective country teams.

6. The World Bank had stressed that the Governments of the two countries would wish to see their leadership role be reaffirmed during the process, and that the main challenge was to ensure that donors' pledges were converted into contributions. The President of the World Bank had expressed the desire to attend a meeting of the Organizational Committee, and members should consider that request at a subsequent meeting. The IPU representative had expressed his organization's readiness to assist the Commission in the area of institutional capacity-building.

7. In view of the need for early preparation by Burundi and Sierra Leone, he and the Vice-Chairpersons had held consultations with representatives of the two countries, and had proposed dates for the briefings and for the country-specific meetings.

8. Sweden's Edberg Foundation had expressed the wish to organize a half-day seminar, in collaboration with the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict, aimed at disseminating updated information on the Peacebuilding Commission to a broader audience, giving the Commission additional momentum and providing it with an opportunity to exchange views with representatives of civil society in the countries concerned.

9. The Foundation had also organized meetings on the subject of the Peacebuilding Commission, from a regional perspective, with representatives of the regions of Asia, Africa and Latin America. He had held meetings with the Directors of the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung and of the United Nations Global Compact, who had both committed themselves to making a significant contribution to the Commission's work within the framework of the respective roles expected of civil society and the private sector.

Selection of participants in country-specific meetings

10. **The Chairman** drew attention to a letter dated 21 June 2006 from the President of the Security Council addressed to the Secretary-General, requesting the Commission's advice on the situations in Burundi and Sierra Leone (PBC/1/OC/2). If he heard no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished

the first two country-specific meetings to address the situations in Burundi and Sierra Leone.

11. *It was so decided.*

Process and schedule of country-specific meetings

12. **The Chairman** said that, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 60/180 and Security Council resolution 1645 (2005), participants in the country-specific meetings should include, in addition to the members of the Organizational Committee, representatives of the country concerned; representatives of countries in the region that were engaged in the post-conflict process and other countries involved in relief efforts and/or political dialogue, and the relevant regional and subregional organizations; representatives of the major financial, troop and civilian police contributors involved in the recovery effort; the senior United Nations representative in the field and other relevant United Nations representatives; and such regional and international financial institutions as might be relevant.

13. In accordance with the same resolutions, representatives of the Secretary-General, the World Bank, IMF and other institutional donors should also be invited to participate in all the Commission's meetings.

14. With respect to the received request for country-specific meetings on Burundi and Sierra Leone, Committee members had before them a document containing a tentative list of members for each meeting. In that regard, he drew the Committee's attention to a minor error in the document. In the right-hand column of the tables shown on the second and third pages of the document, the heading should read "Members/Participants", not "Members". Pursuant to his consultations with the two countries concerned, it was his understanding that they had endorsed the tentative lists, which should be regarded as preliminary in nature.

15. **Mr. Muñoz** (Chile) said that initiatives such as the seminar proposed by Sweden's Edberg Foundation could be very helpful to the Commission's work, and visits to the two countries concerned would also be very important. His delegation attached great importance to the principle of national ownership, and it was therefore important that the two Governments concerned should agree with the proposed lists of members. The Committee should be informed in detail of the two countries' development programmes and priorities, in order that its own advisory work could be defined accordingly.

16. His delegation was pleased that the lists were only tentative, as there might be other actors whose inclusion would be welcome. Moreover, it welcomed the clarification that the lists included both members and participants, as the latter would be invited to participate only in specific meetings. The forthcoming consultation process should include NGOs working in the field, as it was important to benefit from the relevant experience of civil society in country-specific regions. Lastly, his delegation wished to stress the urgency of the Committee's work and the need to proceed quickly in providing assistance to the two countries concerned, perhaps by stepping up the pace of its consultations.

17. **Mr. Brosseau** (France) suggested that the International Organization of la Francophonie, which was deeply involved in the post-conflict situation in Burundi, should be added to the list of participants in the relevant country-specific meeting.

18. **The Chairman** said that he would consider the possibility of including the International Organization of la Francophonie, and would be open to members' suggestions regarding any other additions to the lists.

19. **Mr. Sardenberg** (Brazil) said that his delegation supported the suggestions made to the Chairman by the President of the Economic and Social Council during their preliminary consultations and also agreed with the comments made by the representative of Chile. While he agreed that NGOs should be involved in the consultation process, and that the principle of national ownership should be applied, NGOs should not take part in meetings, and should take part in the process only with the agreement of the country concerned.

20. Participants in the meetings should be given support by the Secretariat, and the relevant documentation should be provided at an early stage of the process in order to facilitate consultations between United Nations missions and their Governments. Furthermore, meetings of experts should be convened, perhaps in August 2006, in order to prepare the Commission's work.

21. With respect to the tentative lists of participants in the country-specific meetings, he wished to know why the European Commission appeared in two different categories: category (b) in the case of

Burundi, and category (c) in the case of Sierra Leone. More data should be available regarding the criteria for establishing the threshold for countries to be considered "major" financial, troop and civilian police contributors, as reflected in category (c).

22. **Mr. Mantovani** (Italy) said that the European Union was a complex organization and that its various constituent entities were involved in a wide range of peacebuilding activities. European Union countries were consulting among themselves as to how the organization should be represented in the country-specific meeting, and agreed that the matter should be given further consideration.

23. **Mr. Mahiga** (United Republic of Tanzania) said that the Committee should clarify the nature of future United Nations representation at the country-specific meeting on Burundi, as reflected in category (d) of the tentative list. An adjustment would be necessary when the mandate of the United Nations Operation in Burundi (ONUB) expired. He noted that, following the second Great Lakes Summit to be held in Nairobi in December 2006, the Great Lakes process would be given its own secretariat in order to reflect national ownership of the process. It might therefore prove necessary to reconsider the appropriate United Nations representation in the Great Lakes region.

24. **Mr. Malhotra** (India) said that his delegation agreed with the representative of Chile that national ownership of the process was important, and welcomed the fact that the two Governments concerned had agreed with the tentative lists. His delegation also agreed with the representative of Brazil that NGOs should be admitted to the process only if the country concerned had given its approval.

25. While he welcomed the differentiation made between members and participants, his delegation was also intrigued as to why the European Commission had been listed in two different categories. Although his delegation would not object to the inclusion of the International Organization of la Francophonie, as suggested by the representative of France, it would be grateful if, in future, similar suggestions could be made in advance, in order to give Committee members an opportunity to determine the nature of such organizations.

26. **Mr. Johnston** (United Kingdom) said that his delegation also welcomed the work being done in consultation with the Governments concerned in order to promote national ownership of the process, and agreed that the lists should be regarded as tentative. The Chairman's differentiation between members and participants was useful.

27. Although the process should be as inclusive as possible, it was his delegation's understanding that, for the purposes of both the Organizational Committee and the country-specific meetings, United Nations Member States would be the members, and the other organizations would be the participants.

28. With respect to the listing of the European Commission in two categories, he said that the World Bank, IMF and — if the Committee so decided — the European Union, as institutional donors, would in fact appear in neither category, as they would be invited to participate in all meetings of the Peacebuilding Commission under the terms of paragraph 9 of General Assembly resolution 60/180, rather than being country-specific choices under the terms of its paragraph 7.

29. **The Chairman** said that the Committee should not allow itself to be bogged down by specific issues such as the representation of the European Union. It was urgent that the Committee should move ahead quickly with its work.

30. **Mr. Abdelaziz** (Egypt) said his delegation agreed that the country-specific meetings should include all active partners on the ground in the countries concerned, and should stress the principle of national ownership of the process. NGOs should participate on a consultative basis and should not be invited to the meetings of the Committee or the Commission.

31. The Committee should be provided with a list of all the members included for each country-specific meeting, together with a detailed justification for their inclusion. Category (b) in the lists should be divided into two categories: one category showing the countries in the region engaged in the post-conflict process and a second category showing countries or organizations involved in the relief efforts and the political dialogue.

32. His delegation did not object to the participation of the European Commission in the country-specific process, on a case-by-case basis. The European Commission should participate only in the meetings of the Organizational Committee, not those of the Peacebuilding Commission.

33. **Mr. Ozawa** (Japan) said he agreed that the Committee should not allow itself to be bogged down

by specific issues. Secondly, the participation of NGOs in the country-specific meetings was critically important, as NGOs were aware of the situation on the ground, especially in areas outside the respective capitals. However, NGO participation should be limited tc those NGOs that had been endorsed by the head of the United Nations entity present in the country concerned and approved by the relevant Government.

34. **The Chairman** said that because of the importance of national ownership, one of the main criteria for the selection of NGOs was the position of the country concerned.

35. **Mr. Muñoz** (Chile) said it was important that the Committee should consult civil society, including experienced NGOs, in accordance with paragraph 21 of Security Council resolution 1645 (2005). The consent of the country concerned would also be necessary.

36. **Ms. Gallardo Hernández** (El Salvador), Vice-Chairman, recalled that, during the preliminary meetings, IPU had requested to participate in the country-specific meetings in cases where its role in the relevant process was a fundamental one, as in the case of the meetings on Burundi and Sierra Leone.

37. **The Chairman** said that he had consulted with IPU, which would continue to play a role in certain countries, including Burundi, particularly in the area of capacity-building. He noted the need for more informal meetings to guide decision-making in the formal meetings.

38. **The Chairman** said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the document containing the tentative list of members for the two forthcoming country-specific meetings.

39. *It was so decided.*

40. **The Chairman** noted that a timeline for meetings of the Organizational Committee was being circulated in the room. He suggested that the Organizational Committee should hold two substantive informal briefings on Burundi and Sierra Leone, to be attended by representatives of the two Governments, senior officials of the United Nations, the World Bank and IMF and outside experts, on 19 July, with the third and fourth formal meetings of the Organizational Committee to be held on 7 and 8 September and 21 September. The meetings of 7 and 8 September would be country-specific meetings on Burundi and Sierra Leone, while the meeting of the 21st would be a follow-up meeting at the ministerial level.

41. **Mr. Malcolm** (United States of America) said that the scheduling would create difficulties for his delegation, since the officials from his Mission who should attend were in Geneva at a meeting of the Economic and Social Council. He asked whether the briefing could instead be scheduled for the first week of August.

42. **Mr. Ozawa** (Japan), referring to the meeting proposed for 21 September, said that the presence of numerous ministers in New York at that time was not, in and of itself, reason to hold a ministerial meeting.

43. **Mr. Abdelaziz** (Egypt) asked the purpose of the meeting scheduled for 21 September. He noted that, if a meeting was to be held at the ministerial level, it was important that all ministers should participate.

44. **The Chairman** pointed out that 21 September was International Peace Day. However, the most important reason for the meeting was to give political approval to the hoped-for results of the meetings scheduled for 7 and 8 September.

45. **Mr. Muñoz** (Chile) said he had no objection to the proposed meeting dates if informal meetings were held in August to provide the opportunity for consultation with as many experts as possible.

46. **Mr. Verbeke** (Belgium) expressed concern that the ministerial meeting might be seen as a mere follow-up to the meetings of 7 and 8 September. It was difficult to say whether substantive work would have been completed by that time. However, the Chairman's lead should be followed in this matter.

47. **Mr. Sardenberg** (Brazil) expressed agreement with the previous speakers; regrettably, however, he could not state with certainty that his foreign minister would be able to attend.

48. **Mr. Malhotra** (India) suggested that, after the meetings of 7 and 8 September, members should take a decision regarding the ministerial meeting.

49. **The Chairman** said that the question whether the meeting on 21 September would be a ministerial meeting would be revisited.

50. **Mr. Christensen** (Denmark) said that in his understanding the purpose of the 19 July briefing was to provide members with information on Sierra Leone

and Burundi. However, if that meeting was going to involve the presentation of information followed by questions and answers, the material concerned would be useful for the country-specific meetings.

51. **Mrs. Mladineo** (Croatia), referring to the proposal put forward by the United States to reschedule the 19 July meeting to the beginning of August, said it would be difficult for small missions to send representatives to the meeting then. Thus, 19 July was preferable to early August.

52. **Mr. Smirnov** (Russian Federation) requested clarification regarding the outside experts mentioned on the tentative list of participants in the country-specific meetings. He would also like to know what the format of the briefings would be.

53. **The Chairman** said that the term "outside expert" referred to experts from institutions or organizations outside the United Nations system.

54. **Mr. Wolfe** (Jamaica) noted that the tentative list of members for the country-specific meetings on Sierra Leone, unlike the list for Burundi, made no mention of countries of the region engaged in post-conflict activities. He wondered what were the key West African countries involved in post-conflict activities for Sierra Leone and, if so, why they were not listed.

55. **Mr. Ntakirutimana** (Burundi) suggested a meeting format which would give each country the opportunity to brief the Organizational Committee in detail. Member countries of the Commission should be invited and should have the opportunity to meet with representatives of Burundi and Sierra Leone to request further details. At a later meeting, strategies could be developed which could have value, for example, during the General Assembly.

56. **Mr. Abdelaziz** (Egypt) said that the meeting of 19 July should provide sufficient time for Burundi and Sierra Leone to describe their strategy and explain what they needed from the Commission. That information should then be discussed in informal meetings with other participants in the country-specific meetings. That meeting should be followed by meetings on 21 and 22 July to follow up the 19 July discussion. He noted that briefings should not be limited to Government and United Nations officials. In reference to the question posed by the representative of Jamaica, the countries in the region involved in post-conflict activities were Nigeria and Ghana. They had not been mentioned separately on the list because they were members of the Commission.

57. **Mr. Akram** (Pakistan) stated that the substantive meeting tentatively scheduled for 19 July should go beyond briefings. It should be interactive and provide the opportunity for Commission members to clarify issues and pose questions. The meeting should begin with briefings by country representatives from Burundi and Sierra Leone. It would be particularly helpful if the speakers were from the capitals, as they would have a clear vision of national post-conflict strategy. Following those briefings, a representative of the Secretariat should provide information on the status of the relevant issues in the Security Council, including discussion of the financial resources required from the international community and identification of the roles played by actors invited to the country. Finally, the Chairman should conclude with a discussion of future action.

58. **The Chairman** said that the 19 July meeting would begin with briefings by authorities from the country about their strategy, with relevant institutions, including institutions from outside the United Nations, participating.

59. **Mr. Johnston** (United Kingdom) said he strongly endorsed the statement made by the representative of Pakistan as the model for how the Commission should proceed. In order for the work to be successful, candid, informal dialogue was required. The proposed date of 19 July was perhaps too soon, given the preparations that would be necessary. He endorsed the point made earlier that a ministerial meeting in September might not be well-advised.

60. **Mr. Majoor** (Netherlands) said that country-specific meetings were the most appropriate place for the Commission to address the substance of country situations. Perhaps the country-specific mode should be launched as early as the meeting set for 19 July.

61. **The Chairman**, replying to a question concerning meeting venues, responded that the intended meeting venue was New York.

62. **Mr. Towpik** (Poland) said that the most important goal was to begin substantive work. The Commission members were largely in agreement as to the format of the 19 July meeting, and it would be best to meet at that time in the planned format and then meet the next day to decide how to proceed.

63. **Mr. Abdelaziz** (Egypt) said that if there was to be no ministerial meeting on 21 September, it might be advisable to limit the meeting on 19 July to briefings by those countries concerned and by the Secretariat, then to begin preparations for a meeting along the lines proposed by the representative of the Netherlands. That meeting could be scheduled for 7 and 8 September, followed by a further country-specific meeting of the Commission on 21 September for consideration and adoption of decisions, if necessary. While he welcomed the proposal to invite all those on the tentative list of participants or at least a representative from each group to attend the briefings on 19 July, those participants would not have sufficient time to prepare adequately or make the necessary arrangements. However, his delegation was willing to accept that date provided that the Committee clarified who the outside experts would be.

64. **Ms. Mladineo** (Croatia), endorsing the comments made by the representatives of Pakistan and the Netherlands, said that background information was needed in advance of a substantive meeting on 19 July, inter alia in the form of input from the capitals concerned. Without such information, delegations would find it difficult to work, and it might be necessary to consider ruling out a ministerial meeting in September, since there would be insufficient time for substantive and constructive work ahead of that meeting.

65. **The Chairman**, welcoming the suggestions made, said that discussions had already been held with the countries concerned as to what would be expected of them at the July meeting, and also with representatives of the World Bank and senior United Nations officials, who had also been advised of the proposed schedule of meetings. The meeting on 19 July would essentially consist of briefings and possibly questions and answers, which would facilitate preparations for the substantive meetings on 7 and 8 September. He also welcomed suggestions to continue to hold informal meetings at the expert level throughout July and August, given the need for clarification of a number of issues in advance of the September meetings. While he understood the concern that the timing of the proposed meeting in July was not ideal, given that it would coincide with the substantive session of the Economic and Social Council in Geneva, those members of delegations who would be remaining in New York could attend the July meeting and brief their colleagues in preparation for the meetings scheduled for September. He understood that much more preparation was needed in order to render the meetings scheduled for September and other meetings more substantive. The proposed date for the fourth formal meeting of the Committee on 21 September would remain under consideration, and might be rescheduled to a later time.

66. **Mr. Abdelaziz** (Egypt) said that while his delegation agreed with the Chairman on the question of the timeline, written documents should be provided in advance of the meeting scheduled for 19 July in order to allow delegations to prepare. To that end, the countries concerned should submit their strategies to the Chairman for translation into the six official languages and subsequent distribution among member States; delegations could then study those documents and discuss them with their respective capitals and, ideally, on a bilateral basis with the countries concerned. They would then be ready for full discussion of the issues raised during the meeting. No progress would be made if the meeting was convened only for oral presentations and discussions.

67. **The Chairman** said that the proposed briefings should not be postponed beyond July, since it was important that the Committee should press ahead with its work as soon as possible.

68. **Mr. Malkin** (United States of America) suggested that the Committee should postpone the July meeting by a week, thus accommodating the valid concern expressed by previous speakers regarding the need for written information and allowing more time for participants to prepare. However, not wishing to disrupt the proposed timeline, his delegation was willing to agree to hold the meeting on 19 July.

69. **The Chairman** said that while postponement by one week was possible, it would put pressure on the Secretariat to provide the necessary documentation. It was preferable that the July meeting should take place as scheduled. The Secretariat had consulted with the authorities of Sierra Leone and Burundi in order to ensure that the proposed dates were convenient, and would consult them also regarding the participation of representatives from the capitals.

70. **Mr. Ozawa** (Japan) said that while his delegation understood the concerns that written documents were required in advance of the meeting, it was undesirable to postpone the scheduled briefings on 19 July, particularly since a great deal of effort had been undertaken to organize them.

71. **The Chairman** said he took it that the Committee wished to hold its substantive briefing on 19 July.

72. *It was so decided.*

Other matters

Briefing on the Peacebuilding Fund and on the Peacebuilding Support Office

73. **The Chairman** drew attention to a document containing two briefing notes relating to the establishment of the Peacebuilding Fund and that of the Peacebuilding Support Office, respectively.

74. **Mr. Benomar** (Special Adviser on Crisis Prevention and Recovery, United Nations Development Programme) said that, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 60/180, the Secretary-General had decided to engage Member States in a process of consultations leading to the development of the terms of reference of the Peacebuilding Fund, including arrangements for its governance and modus operandi, which were to be summarized in the report of the Secretary-General to the General Assembly at its sixty-first session. To that end, a technical working group comprising United Nations experts on trust fund issues had been established, and numerous consultations had been held with member States to seek their views and thus ensure that the final terms of reference were based on broad consensus. In order to finalize the terms of reference as soon as possible, the Permanent Mission of Sweden had taken the initiative to organize many of the consultations, and great progress had been made. Although no formal date had yet been scheduled for the launch of the Fund, the forthcoming meetings in September would be a suitable occasion. A number of contributions had already been made to the Fund, which was already approaching half the target sum of 250 million dollars, and several pledges had been announced.

75. Regarding the Peacebuilding Support Office, he informed the Committee that the position of Head of Office had already been filled. Ms. McAskie of Canada would be assuming her functions formally at the end of August or beginning of September. Three posts in the Professional category and three in the General Service category were also available, and were expected to be filled by September or October. In addition, the Secretary-General intended to seek three secondments from agencies within the United Nations system, to which end the agencies concerned had been approached to nominate three candidates with a view to their appointment in August. Five posts to be made available through redeployment were expected to be allocated to the Peacebuilding Support Office shortly. The Office as it stood consisted of a small transition team supplemented by a small number of part-time staff. While its capacity in the coming few weeks would be very limited, it would nonetheless do its best to support the Commission during that period.

76. **The Chairman** said that the support that the Peacebuilding Support Office had already given to the Chairman and the Vice-Chairpersons was commendable. The Committee would continue work with the Secretariat in order to enable the Office to enter into full operation as soon as possible.

Letter from the President of the European Commission

77. **The Chairman** drew attention to a letter dated 8 June 2006 from the President of the European Commission addressed to the Secretary-General requesting that the European Commission be considered an institutional donor within the terms of paragraph 9 of General Assembly resolution 60/180 and paragraph 9 of Security Council resolution 1645 (2005) and therefore be invited in that capacity to all meetings of the Peacebuilding Commission.

78. In his understanding that interpretation was in accordance with the provisions to which the letter referred. Such an invitation would not, however, confer the right of membership of the Organizational Committee.

79. He proposed that the question should be addressed on a case-by-case basis, particularly when country-specific meetings were considered, and stressed the importance of reaching a consensus within the Organizational Committee.

80. **Mr. Christensen** (Denmark), speaking on behalf of those members of the Organizational Committee that were European Union members, said that the institutional donors played an important role in supporting and enhancing the work of the Peacebuilding Commission, and that the Commission would benefit greatly from their maximal involvement both in country-specific meetings and meetings of the Organizational Committee. He therefore urged the Commission to agree to a model whereby institutional donors were invited on a permanent basis to all meetings.

81. **Mr. Awad** (Egypt) said that it was his delegation's understanding that paragraph 9 of General Assembly resolution 60/180 referred to meetings of the Commission in all its configurations. However, while his delegation endorsed the comments made by the representative of Denmark, it was uncomfortable with the proposal for a standing invitation. The institutional donors should not be invited automatically, but on a case-by-case basis according to whether such participation was deemed appropriate and necessary by the Committee. Notwithstanding that comment, their permanent participation would be beneficial, and could be provided for in the future.

82. **Mr. Tarragô** (Brazil) said that the request by the President of the European Commission should be examined in more detail vis-à-vis in the light of paragraph 9 of General Assembly resolution 60/180. The treatment of the European Commission on a par with institutions such as the IMF and the World Bank would give the impression that the institutions referred to in paragraph 9 were the same as or similar to the IMF and the World Bank. The European Commission was of a unique nature in that it was not only an institutional donor but also had many other functions, and therefore differed significantly from those agencies. In that light, his delegation requested that the Committee defer consideration of the issue in order to allow delegations more time to examine it.

83. **The Chairman** endorsed the comments made by the representative of Brazil.

84. **Mr. Johnston** (United Kingdom), responding to the comments made by the representative of Egypt, said that it was his understanding of paragraph 9 of General Assembly resolution 60/180 that the World Bank, the IMF and any other institution determined by the Organizational Committee as constituting an institutional donor would be invited to participate in all meetings of the Commission, and that that invitation was therefore a standing invitation, in accordance also with paragraph 9 of Security Council resolution 1645 (2005) and paragraph 102 of the World Summit Outcome contained in document A/RES/60/1. It was therefore difficult to understand why that provision should be the subject of contention, leading to the proposal for a case-by-case approach. His delegation strongly endorsed the view that the European Commission should be considered an institutional donor, particularly since it was a multinational organization and a major donor in many countries that were relevant to the work of the Peacebuilding Commission.

85. He disagreed that the invitation to institutional donors, whether generic or case by case, should apply only to country-specific meetings. Since the Peacebuilding Commission consisted of various configurations, it was logical to interpret an invitation to all meetings as implying all meetings of the Organizational Committee in addition to country-specific meetings. It was clear from paragraph 9 that the institutional donors would not be members, but they would nonetheless be highly valued participants.

86. **The Chairman** said that the Committee could, in principle, agree to invite the European Commission to participate in meetings as and when it deemed such participation appropriate, and would continue to analyse the question pending further comments from member States. In the case of Sierra Leone and Burundi, the European Commission was clearly an important institutional donor whose participation would certainly be welcome.

87. **Mr. Wolfe** (Jamaica) said that his delegation strongly endorsed the comments made by the representative of Egypt. As a beneficiary country, Jamaica would be happy to welcome the European Commission as an institutional donor, whether invited on a case-by-case basis or otherwise. However, a distinction should be made between meetings of the Organizational Committee and those of the Commission. He would therefore welcome further consideration of the matter before a decision was taken.

88. **Mr. Malhotra** (India) requested that a copy of the letter be circulated for closer consideration.

89. **The Chairman** said he took it that the Committee wished him to circulate the letter of the President of the European Commission.

90. *It was so decided.*

91. He also took it that the Committee wished to resume its consideration of the matter at its next meeting, and in the meantime hold consultations with a view to the adoption of a format acceptable to all members.

92. *It was so decided.*

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.